	Case 2:95-cr-00143-GEB-GGH Docume	nt 183 Filed 09/14/15 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
5	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
6		
7	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 2:95-cr-00143-GEB-GGH-2
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
10	PRESTON JOEL MAYS,	MOTIONS FOR REDUCTION OF SENTENCE
11	Defendant.	
12		
13	On November 7, 2014, and January 5, 2015, Defendant	
14	Preston Joel Mays filed, in pro per, what appear to be identical	
15	motions for the modification of his sentence under 18 U.S.C. §	
16	3582(c)(2). (ECF Nos. 177, 178.) In essence, Defendant argues	
17	Amendment 782 to the Sentencing Guidelines and his favorable	
18	post-sentencing conduct justify a reduction of his sentence.	
19	The government rejoins that "[D]efendant does not	
20	qualify for a sentence reduction[,]" arguing:	
21	To be eligible for a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2), [D]efendant must show	
22	that his sentence was "based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by	
23	the Sentencing Commission" and (2) "such a reduction is consistent with applicable	
24	policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission." United States v. Wesson, 583	
25		
26	2D1.1 and reduced by two levels the [base] offense level applicable to many	
27	drug offenses, became effective on November 1, 2014. Moreover, the Sentencing Commission voted to make Amendment 782 retroactively applicable to previously-	

<sup>2</sup>D1.1 and reduced by two levels the [base] offense level applicable to many drug offenses, became effective on November 1, 2014. Moreover, the Sentencing Commission voted to make Amendment 782 retroactively applicable to previously-sentenced defendants." United States v. Viengkham, No. 1:11-cr-00052-MCE-4, 2015 WL 273314, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 21, 2015).

## 

to

by

defendant's

F.3d 728, 730 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)).

the kilograms[,] . . results in [the same Base]

Offense Level of 36. U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(c)(2) (setting Base Offense Level of 36 for offense

involving drug quantity between 1.5 and 4.5

kilograms of methamphetamine (actual)). Thus,

months to life remains the same today as at

Amendment

base

consequently, his guideline range of

it was during his original sentencing.

Under the current version of § 2D1.1,

amount of methamphetamine (actual)

defendant,]

offense level

782

is

2

1

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

11

(Gov't Opp'n 3:2-3, 3:8-25, ECF No. 181.)

attributed

unaffected

this

"As a general matter, courts may not alter a term of imprisonment once it has been imposed." United States v. Leniear, 574 F.3d 668, 673 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting United States v. Hicks, 472 F.3d 1167, 1169 (9th Cir. 2007)).

> However, 18 U.S.C.  $\S$  3582(c)(2) creates an exception to this rule by allowing modification of a term of imprisonment if: (1) the sentence is "based on a sentencing range that has subsequently been lowered by the Sentencing Commission"; and (2) "such a reduction is consistent with applicable policy statements issued by the Sentencing Commission."

Id. (quoting 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2)).

The Sentencing Commission policy statement relevant to this case prescribes: "[a] reduction in the defendant's term of imprisonment is not consistent with this policy statement and therefore is not authorized under 18 U.S.C. 3582(c)(2) if . . . [the relevant] amendment . . . does not have the effect of lowering the defendant's applicable guideline range." U.S.S.G. §

## 

1B1.10(a)(2).

Here, the Presentence Report recommended a base offense level of 36 using the 1995 edition U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1 based upon an amount of methamphetamine (actual) of 2,493.3 grams, or 2.49 kilograms. (PSR ¶ 12.) Under the amended Drug Quantity Table, the base offense level for this amount of methamphetamine (actual) is still 36. U.S.S.G. § 2D1.1(c)(2) (setting Base Offense Level of 36 for offense involving drug quantity between 1.5 and 4.5 kilograms of methamphetamine (actual)). "Because [Amendment 782] does not result in a different sentencing range [in this case], the defendant is not eligible for a sentencing reduction pursuant to Section 3582(c)(2)." United States v. Gonzalez, No. 1:94-CR-5011 LJO, 2015 WL 854206, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2015). Therefore, Defendant's motions for reduction of sentence are DENIED.

Dated: September 14, 2015

BURRELL, JR.

Senior United States District Judge